DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 109 041 SO 008 479

AUTHOR Cleaver, Betty
TITLE A Brief Survey of Values Education.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 36p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Curriculum Development; *Educational Development; *Educational History; Elementary Secondary Education; *Moral Development; Moral Values; *School Role; Social Development; Socialization; Social Studies; *Values

ABSTRACT

A four-part series of papers on values education comprises this document. Part one presents a brief background of moral education in the United States, beginning with the Puritans, and including references to Horace Mann, William Holmes McGuffey, and others. Tracing its history, the author defines values education and its need in the school system. Values and values clarification are examined in the second part of the document, stressing the process of valuing of Raths and Simon. Seven criteria describe the process of valuing, including choosing freely, choosing from alternatives, choosing after thoughtful consideration of consequences, prizing and cherishing, affirming, acting upon choices, and repeating. The role of the school and society and values education is examined in part three. The school cannot prescribe the values, but it can provide an atmosphere of intellectual freedom and can aid the student in developing his capability for rational analysis. In the fourth section, the author examines the state of research on values education. (Author/JR)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED109041

A BRIEF SURVEY OF VALUES EDUCATION

by

Betty Cleaver

VALUES EDUCATION: PART I*

Betty Cleaver, Director
Instructional Materials Center
School of Education, UNC-CH

Background of Moral Education in the United States

Americans like to sort, label, and classify their ideas, and quite often put them in a storage box, to be brought out on special occasions. In the short history of American education, one of the ideas which seems to go in and out of storage frequently is the concept of moral education. The terminology may change and the interpretations vary, but the basic question remains: Should the public schools be involved with moral instruction?

This question was dealt with by the Puritans, who established schools to provide the means for maintaining their society. The school was to teach reading, writing, and religion, and in so doing, would insure "the good of the state and, in turn, the good of God."[1] The Puritans were a vigorous, uncompromising, spiritual people who, nevertheless, were of this world. Their efforts to translate moral principles into right actions emphasize the important part their schools had in shaping the behavior of the child in accordance with the Protestant Ethic.

The Puritan notion that the schools offered a way of leading men to higher endeavors for the good of society is evident, many decades later, in the life of Horace Mann. Although he was a successful young lawyer, in 1837 he allowed himself to be persuaded to serve as secretary to the new State Board of Education of Massachusetts, because he believed he "ought" to serve. "I have abandoned jurisprudence and betaken myself to the larger sphere of mind and morals," he

said.[2] For twelve years he served the Massachusetts school system, analyzing the needs of the schools and eloquently pleading their cause. He believed in a universal common school which would serve all groups equally. He held that religion whould be in the schools but a religion should not be taught there. Students should be educated for future participation in their government, and to this end the student should be given a moral education, which is "a primal necessity of social existence."[3] He suggested that men accept the idea that the child should be trained in the way he should go, but said the experiment had never been tried. In his view, moral principles could be imposed by the teacher. In his Twelfth Annual Report to the State Board of Education, He expanded his belief in public education and defended his position against sectarian schools, saying that religion was already in the schools and moral education was provided:

> And, further, our law explicitly and solemnly enjoins it upon all teachers, without any exception, to exert their best endeavors, to impress on the minds of children and youth committed to their care and instruction, the principles of piety, justice, and a sacred regard to truth, love to their country, humanity, and universal benevolence, sobriety, industry, and frugality, chastity, moderation, and temperance, and those other virtues which are the ornament of human society, and the basis upon which a republican constitution is founded.[4]

While Horace Mann was striving to improve education in Massachusetts, William Holmes McGuffey was composing elementary readers which used literature to teach the child to read. His First Eclectic Reader was published in 1836, and was followed by others until the series was completed in 1863. The McGuffey Readers were in general use in American schools of the 1800's.

McGuffey was interested in elementary education and used the Readers not only to teach reading but also to encourage an appreciation of literature and to inculcate moral principles in the child. This morality was of a religious character - indeed, the stories were often pious and righteous in tone.

Commager says the morality of the Readers was providential - everything happened for the best, according to the workings of Providence. He asks if this is not an abrogation of both personal and corporate responsibility. The materialistic nature of the McGuffey morality is seen in the system of rewards and punishments found in the stories. Virtue is rarely its own reward: the poor boy who helped the old man across the street got a job, and the honest clerk who returned the money he found got a promotion. On the other hand, wickedness is punished; the disobedient boy may drown.

> Nothing was left to the imagination, nothing to chance, and nothing, one is tempted to say, to conscience. It is an intriguing - but unanswerable - question whether this kind of moral arithmetic eventually did more harm than good; those who are today infatuated with the Readers might reflect that the generation most elaborately and persistently exposed to it - the generation roughly from the forties to the eighties - was probably the most materialistic generation in our history.[5]

The McGuffey Readers were very widely used, and it is estimated that 122,000,000 copies were sold between 1836 and 1920.[6] They acted as a unifying force in American culture, providing schoolchildren of the nineteenth century "with a common body of allusion and a common frame of reference"[7] - a frame of reference with moral parameters.

This kind of moral education, centered around the transmission of moral principles, was challenged by John Dewey. He proclaimed that knowledge of what is right is not a substitute for right conduct. Our idea of moral education had been too narrow, he said, and had been associated with teaching certain virtues. "Ultimate moral motives and forces are nothing more or less than social intelligence - the power of observing and comprehending social situations - and social power..."[8] Unfortunately, the school emphasizes the habits of promptness, regularity, and industry - habits which will preserve the system. It should emphasize the ideas which may effect a change in the

student's conduct. The child is a part of the social order - he is a member of his school, his family, his neighbo:hood. The same principles which govern his conduct in school will govern it elsewhere. His school life cannot be separated from his participation in other areas of social life. But, said Dewey, the school seems more interested in the child's processes of absorption and learning than in his application of ideas. If we want the student to exhibit certain modes of conduct, we must give him a chance to use selective judgment and apply knowledge to new situations. "He will then have the opportunity to test his judgments and translate moral ideas into his own behavior."[9]

While education was always expected to serve society, it was chiefly concerned with training for citizenship. Until World War I the American people had been confident that democracy was the best form of government and would survive. In the late 1930's there was an increased awareness of the possibility that democracy might perish. The Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association prepared a report, in 1936, which suggested that democracy is not automatic, that the democratic process is vital and ever-changing, and that the school must maintain an eternal vigilance to protect the integrity of education and the continuation of democratic processes.[10]

The teachers' enduring concern for moral principles led to a survey by the Educational Policies Commission on the role of the public school in the development of moral and spiritual values. The Executive Committee of the National Education Association asked the Commission to develop ways to improve the teaching of values; their report was published in 1950. It reaffirmed the duty of the school to uphold the ideals of American democracy - individual and religious freedom. "The development of moral and spiritual values is basic to all other educational objectives."[11] It quoted a 1938 Commission Report, <u>The Purposes of Education in American Democracy</u>: "that which, out

of their intelligence and experience, the people declare to be good, they will attempt to maintain and perpetuate...They strive through education to transmit what they think is good to all the generations to come."[12]

The Commission defined values as "those values which, when applied in human behavior, exalt and refine life and bring it into accord with the standards of conduct that are approved in our democratic culture."[13] It said that there was a generally accepted body of values which Americans professed. These included: the importance of the individual personality; moral responsibility - bearing the consequences of one's acts; the institution as the servant of man; common consent over violence; devotion to truth; respect for excellence; moral equality; brotherhood; the individual pursuit of happiness; and spiritual experience. Many of these are treated in the Bill of Rights. The Report suggested that when a school wants to emphasize the teaching of values, it first make its own list of the values considered important by its staff, parents, and children. It included methods for the teaching of values and a reminder that the school and parent share in this endeavor.

One hundred years after Horace Mann articulated his thoughts on moral education, the terminology changed. "Moral education" gave way to "values". Perhaps this change was an unconscious rebellion against moral judgments being imposed on the child from outside. John Dewey wanted the child to learn to make his own decisions. The Commission Report reflected both viewpoints - the objective naming and the subjective choosing of values.

While Americans use the term moral education less frequently today than formerly, the British still use it. In 1962 a series of nine addresses on "Moral Education in a Changing Society" attracted overflow audiences to the Assembly Hall of the University of London School of Education. The dean of the Institute, W. R. Niblett, used "moral education" and "values" interchangeably. "Moral education involves decision and action," he said.[14] And, in the

same breath: "Our values must shine through our actions and the very way we teach if they are to get over..."[15] He submitted four principles of moral education: a greater recognition of the common humanity of young and old - what we have in common with our children is more important than the years separating us; the fostering of identity; the exercise of power of choice at many levels; and a greater encouragement of initiative and of taking responsibility. Without personal decision, there is no morality.

Grace Kachaturoff suggested that ethics and values are interlocking concepts. Ethics deal with what is right or what ought to be; values deal with what is desirable. Ethics are often interwoven with religious beliefs but may be considered apart from religion. Moral education, she said, teaches not only principles, but also virtues - "right habits or dispositions to act in accordance with moral principles."[16] The school's business is to "promote the good and moral life,"[17] teaching the student what the values of life are.

Most educators link behavior with values. Bruce Joyce called values "ideal types of behavior toward which people manifest positive emotion."[18] Kachaturoff called them ideal pictures which, when used to judge the quality of human actions, become standards.[19] Samuel Brodbelt mirrored Raths' definition: values are beliefs which determine one's behavior; they are the ideas and beliefs upon which one acts.[20]

Although educators may differ in their ideas about values education, there seems to be a consensus on the need for teaching for values in the schools. This concern was manifested in the designation of "Values and the Curriculum" as the theme of the Fourth International Curriculum Conference in 1969. These curriculum conferences have served as clearinghouses for the exchange of ideas, announcements of new programs, and reports on experimental

curricula. Participants from England, Canada, and the United States have attended. In writing his report on the conference on values, William Carr said the theme was selected "in the earnest belief that values have a central place in the schools of those participating countries...the social, economic, and political systems of these countries rest on certain basic values. The relation between these values and the program of education is therefore of fundamental importance."[21] There was agreement on the proposition that children should be helped to discover their own system of values. Carr said it was generally true that "groups concerned with younger children tended to favor value development by the young. On the other hand, the groups on secondary education tended to insist on the responsibility of the schools to the society in general and to the values which that society approves. The secondary education groups also tended to resist both the idea that values are rather finally formed in early childhood, and the conclusion that priority should be given to affective learning over cognitive learning. They tended instead to emphasize the need for informed and rational judgments in the value-building process."[22] This general statement may be a clue to the present place of values in secondary education. It was a synthesis of reactions from teacher education representatives, classroom teachers, and high school students.

What conditions or events in our society have led to the call for a renewed emphasis on values? Is this search for direction, this desire to inculcate and transmit values, a new phenomenon?

It is true that primitive societies held certain traditions, beliefs, and actions, to be of worth - but the primitive society was a static one. Members of that society all held the same values, which were passed on to the young as customs to be observed and emulated. There was no need for the formal teaching of values. Primitive societies were fixed in time; agriculture

and, later, industrialization brought changes - but the rate of change was slow until the twentieth century, when problems seemed to increase in geometric proportions. The aftermath of World War I brought disillusionment to a nation intent upon saving the world for democracy. The development of jet planes and Telstar meant instant communication throughout the earth. The "One World" of Wendell Willkie was made possible by technology; it was not attained, because man did not include it in his system of values.

Modern society is complex. Kachaturoff pointed out that "since World War II and the scientific-industrial revolution, man has been launched into a dangerous world - a world filled with fear, anxiety, loneliness, hopelessness, and nothingness."[23] He has created weapons which can annihilate his kind, and technology which can destroy his life-support system. Faced with these threatening possibilities, he must develop a system of values which will give structure and meaning to his life and assure his survival.[24]

In such a world, it is not surprising to find many youth rebelling against the values of the older generation. They see a discrepancy between what their parents profess and what they do. Brodbelt suggested that the value conflict represented by youth is more serious than conflicts in previous eras because youth under 25 have a voting majority, and constitute a better educated, better informed group than current political and societal leaders.[25]

While their parents declare a reverence for human life, students watching television can see bombings, shootings, violent accidents - <u>as they happen</u>. They know that medical science has prolonged man's life, but they see the neglect of the elderly. They see men in high government office accused of lying, stealing, and bribery. And they hear these men defending their actions on the basis that the end justifies the means. Watergate had demonstrated the need for "considering ethical values as a vital facet of education."[26] Ralph

Kirkman, editor of the Peabody Journal of Education, has reminded us that almost all of the men involved in Watergate were highly educated. Where have the schools failed?

Loukes, who participated in the lecture series at the London Institute of Education, blamed adults for following a neutral course in moral training. "Under the influence of the image of Freudianism - so different from the percipient and illuminating thought of Freud himself - we shrink from imposing our father-figures, of setting up conflicts between id and super-ego, so anxious to liberate our children from our own shortcomings, that we leave them to do their growing without a framework."[27]

What responsibility does the school have for providing this framework? It has a major function - that of helping the student examine the values which are reflected in the problems of society, and encouraging him to examine his own beliefs. The school can provide an environment which is non-threatening and non-judgmental. In this atmosphere the student is free to interpret his experiences, and analyze the values he holds which have led to certain behavior. "The school can also furnish a climate in which youngsters sense that certain positive values are desired; it can encourage social groups within the school to reflect some of these major values; it can select and support teachers whose personalities are attractive to students and who reflect these values."[28]

Although there are differences of methodology among writers on values education there seems to be agreement that democracy, imperfect as it is, offers the best hope for man to realize his own potential. Democracy, which is a moral system of government, depends on moral man for its success. The Greeks believed in educating the individual so he could develop into a virtuous citizen. Over 2000 years later, Jerome Kagan said in an interview:

> I want to see schools begin to serve the needs of society. Ancient Sparta needed warriors, Athens needed a sense of the hero, the ancient Hebrews needed knowledge of the Testament, nineteenth-century Americans needed managers and technicians - and the schools responded beautifully in each case by providing the kind of people the society needed. What do we need now? I believe that we need to restore faith, honesty, humanity. And I am suggesting in deep seriousness that we must, in the school, begin to reward these traits as the Spartans rewarded physical fitness. I want children rank-ordered on the basis of humanism as we rank-order on the basis of reading and mathematics. I'm dead serious. When I was a kid, deportment was always a grade. In a funny way, I want that, but instead of deportment I want him graded on humanism: How kind is he? How nurturant is he?
>
> Every society must sort its children according to the traits it values. We will never get away from that. A society needs a set of people whom it can trust in and give responsibility to for the management of its capital and resources, for the health of its people, the legal prerogatives of its people, the wars of its people. The function of the school system is in fact to prepare this class.[29]

It would be hard to disagree with Kagan's emphasis on faith, honesty and humanity, but surely the function of the school system is not the preparation of a "class". Democracy does not divide its peoples according to the character traits they display. Any kind of grading based on student-held values would clearly be a value judgment on the part of the teacher.

Here, then, is the dilemma of values education. How can one teach values without imposing his own?

Moral Power and Social Intelligence

> Can you tell me Socrates - is virtue something that can be taught? Or does it come by practice? Or is it neither teaching nor practice that gives it to a man but natural aptitude or something else?
>
> --Meno[30]

Meno's question to Socrates has hung in the air, unanswered, for many centuries. Is virtue a result of moral education? Is virtue a value? In

the 20th century there have been serious attempts to investigate these questions both philosophically and empirically. John Dewey was careful to make a distinction between moral ideas and ideas about morality. Moral ideas, he said, "take effect in conduct and improve it", while ideas about morality can be generalized opinions which cause no action or behavior and may be moral, immoral, or indifferent.[31] Our idea of moral education has been too narrow. "We have associated the term ethical with certain special acts which are labeled virtues and are set off from the mass of other acts, and are still more divorced from the habitual images and motives of the children performing them. Moral instruction is thus associated with teaching about these particular virtues, or with instilling certain sentiments in regard to them. The moral has been conceived in too goody-goody a way. Ultimate moral motives and forces are nothing more or less than social intelligence - the power of observing and comprehending social situations - and social power - trained capacities of control - at work in the service of social interest and aims. There is no fact which throws light upon the constitution of society, there is no power whose training adds to social resourcefulness that is not moral."[32] In linking moral education with social intelligence Joyn Dewey laid the groundwork for the structure of values education in the 1970's.

NOTES

1. Bernard Mehl, "Education in American History," Foundations of Education, 2nd ed., ed. by George F. Kneller (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1967), p. 9.

2. Horace Mann, The Republic and the School, ed. by Lawrence A. Cremin (New York: Teachers College, Columbia, 1957), p. 3.

3. Ibid., p. 98.

4. Ibid., p. 106.

5. Henry Steele Commager, "Foreword", McGuffey's Fifth Eclectic Reader 1879 Edition (New York: New American Library, 1962), p. viii.

6. Ibid., Frontispiece.

7. Ibid., p. xii.

8. John Dewey, Moral Principles in Education (New York: Philosophical Library, 1959), p.43.

9. Ibid.

10. Educational Policies Commission, National Education Association, The Unique Function of Education in American Democracy (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1937).

11. Educational Policies Commission, National Education Association, Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public Schools (Washington, D. C.: NEA, 1951), p. 6.

12. Ibid., p. 7.

13. Ibid., p. 13.

14. W. R. Niblett, "Some Problems in Moral Education," Moral Education in a Changing Society, ed. by W. R. Niblett (London: Faber and Faber L mited, 1963), p. 28.

15. Ibid., p. 28.

16. Grace Kachaturoff, "Teaching Values in the Public Schools," The Social Studies, LXIV, No. 5 (October, 1973), p. 225.

17. Ibid., p. 225.

18. Bruce R. Joyce, New Strategies for Social Education (Chicago: SRA, 1972), p. 208.

19. Kachaturoff, "Teaching Values in the Public Schools", p. 224.

20. Samuel Brodbelt, "Values in Conflict: Youth Analyzes Theory and Practice", The High School Journal, Vol. 55, No. 2 (November, 1971).

21. William G. Carr, ed., Values and the Curriculum: A Report of the Fourth International Curriculum Conference (Washington, D. C.: NEA, 1970), p. 5.

22. Ibid., p. 27.

23. Kachaturoff, "Teaching Values in the Public Schools", p. 222.

24. Ibid., p. 222.

25. Brodbelt, "Values in Conflict", p. 64.

26. Ralph E. Kirkman, "The Role of Ethnics in Education", Peabody Journal of Education, Vol. 51, No. 1 (October, 1973), p. 1.

27. H. Loukes, "Responsibility and Irresponsibility in Adolescents", Moral Education in a Changing Society. p. 146.

28. Ralph W. Tyler, quoted by Brodbelt, "Values in Conflict", p. 72.

29. "A Conversation with Jerome Kagan", Saturday Review of Education, Vol. 1, No. 3 (April, 1973), p. 43.

30. Plato, "The Meno", in Plato: Protagoras and Meno, Trans. by W.K.C. Guthrie (Baltimore, md: Penguin Books, 1956), p. 115.

31. John Dewey, Moral Principles in Education (New York: Philosophical Library, 1959), p. 1.

32. Ibid., pp. 42-43.

VALUES EDUCATION: PART II

Betty Cleaver, Director
Instructional Materials Center
School of Education, UNC-CH

Values and Values Clarification

Louis Raths was profoundly influenced by Dewey's writings, especially by his Theory of Valuation,[1] and considered "for some time what might be the implications of value development for teachers".[2] He evolved a theory of values which "seems to offer concrete and effective aid to teachers". This theory is concerned with the process of valuing, not with values as entities. What a man believes is not so important as how he comes to believe it. What he believes, he will act upon. If we can determine why we believe in certain principles, this knowledge could have a profound effect on the society in which we live.

Raths noted that there are increasing numbers of students who are unclear about their purposes in life and their relationship to society. These students may be apathetic, flighty, uncertain, inconsistent; they may be drifters, overconformers, overdissidents, or role players.[4] They all have one thing in common - they are confused about their values. Raths worked with students with physical disabilities for many years; then he worked with children with emotional disturbances. The understandings and practices directed to these children should, he thought, be appropriate for children who have value-related disturbances. The children's apathy and uncertainty might disappear as they learned how to form their own values.[5]

Values are guides to behavior; they show "what we tend to do with our limited time and energy".[6] Raths, Harmin and Simon were not concerned with

particular values, nor did they judge people by their values. However, they have explored the ways in which people obtain their values. They have formulated seven criteria which describe the process of valuing. If all of the criteria are met, the idea is considered to be a value. All these criteria must be met:

1.) Choosing freely. If the idea is the result of coercion it will not be a guiding principle.

2.) Choosing from among alternatives. There are some things which offer no choice. A man has to eat and sleep. Where he eats or what he eats offers an alternative, but eating itself is not a value.

3.) Choosing after thoughtful consideration of the consequences of each alternative. Impulsive choices do not lead to values.

4.) Prizing and cherishing. When we prize something we hold it dear. We are happy with our choice.

5.) Affirming. When we have chosen freely from several alternatives, then we are willing to publicly affirm our values.

6.) Acting upon choices. A value gives direction to living. We do those things which are important to us.

7.) Repeating. If something is a value, it will show up in different situations at different times. Values persist and make a pattern in our lives.[7]

Values are based on three processes: choosing, prizing, and acting.

Choosing: (1) freely
(2) from alternatives
(3) after thoughtful consideration of the consequences of each alternative

Prizing: (4) cherishing, being happy with the choice
(5) willing to affirm the choice publicly

Acting: (6) doing something with the choice
(7) repeatedly, in some pattern of life[8]

The results of these processes are called values.

There are many beliefs a person holds which do not meet all the criteria for values. Some things which are different from values might indicate the presence of a value. In Raths' theory of values these would be called value

indicators. They are:

1.) Goals or purposes. A purpose or goal gives direction to life. If it is important to us we cherish it, and act upon it. The purpose we state may be only a passing fancy - when we examine it we are not willing to act on it. A purpose may be a value, but doesn't have to be.

2.) Aspirations. Some goals or purposes are remote in terms of accomplishment. This may indicate something that is valued; it still must meet the seven criteria to be a value.

3.) Attitudes. We have attitudes - positive or negative - toward most things. If we feel strongly enough about something to prize and cherish it, choose it after consideration of alternatives, if it meets all the criteria, it is a value. On the other hand, careful examination may show that this idea is not backed up by action.

4.) Interests. Often when we indicate an interest in something we mean only that we would like to talk about it or hear about it. An interest may become a value, if it meets the criteria.

5.) Feelings. Our responses are often emotional and spontaneous. They may indicate values, but they may be only surface reactions to a situation.

6.) Beliefs and convictions. A verbal statement may indicate a value but it must first be closely examined. Do we speak against racial discrimination and yet vote against open housing? When beliefs and convictions give a framework for life, they are probably values.

7.) Activities. Actions speak louder than words, children are told. A man may profess honesty as a value but look into someone's hand at the bridge table. How we habitually act is usually a good indication of what we consider important.

8.) Worries, problems, obstacles. Verbalizing our concerns may reveal deeply held convictions or values, but it may be a way of "letting off steam". Examining the problem may reveal a belief that is being blocked, a disturbance in our way of meeting life, and if this blocked belief meets the criteria, then a value is indicated.[9]

It is important in working with students to help them differentiate between these eight categories of behavior and the underlying values which they may - or may not - indicate. These value indicators defined by Raths, Harmin, and Simon are signals which the alert teacher will intercept and use in the examination of the valuing process.

The first process, and perhaps the most critical, is that of choosing. A value is not inherited, and, while our attitudes may reflect parental or cultural values, we need to examine alternative ideas or actions, consider the consequences of each, and then choose freely, unhampered by outside pressures. The teacher needs to be particularly careful not to set up conditions which would influence the student's choice. It is difficult to allow a child freedom to choose; it is much more difficult to abide by his decision it it conflicts with our own ideas.

The old approach to helping children develop values was based on a predetermined set of values, which were taught by persuasion and indoctrination. The approach advocated here is for children to examine their own values and those of other people in a spirit of thoughtfulness and free inquiry. This may come about through the teacher's use of the value clarifying method.

The basic strategy of the value clarifying method depends on how the teacher responds to what the student says and does.[10] When the teacher makes a value clarifying response he is stimulating the student to consider what he has chosen, what he does, what he prizes. There are ten characteristics of an effective clarifying response.

1. It avoids moralizing, criticizing, evaluating. No hint of "good" or "bad" is given.
2. It makes the student responsible for looking at his own behavior and ideas to see what he really wants.
3. It is permissive, not insistent on student participation.
4. It aims at setting a mood, introducing a new thought. It is a small comment which sets a mood for reflection.
5. It is not used to gather data.
6. It is not used for extended discussion. It is almost incidental, and is limited to a short round of dialogue.
7. It is for an individual, not a group.

8. It is an occasional response; this kind of response is not made to everything the student says.

9. It is made in discussing feelings, attitudes and beliefs. It does not solicit a predetermined answer.

10. It is not mechanical but is creative, with a purpose in mind.[11]

These conditions are difficult to meet. The teacher must guard against imposing his own ideas; his purpose is to invite self analysis by administering small prods.

The authors give many examples of clarifying responses, suggesting that the teacher study them and note those which he would feel comfortable in using. "Have you considered any alternatives? Are you glad about that? Have you felt this way for a long time? How did you reach your decision?" This kind of question will prod the student to think and will give him the responsibility for thinking through his problems.[12]

Having established this base, the authors outline specific techniques for value analysis which can be used in the classroom. One method to use with a group is the Value Sheet. This consists of a provocative statement and a series of questions which are given to the students. The statement may come from a newspaper, a speech, a book or any appropriate source. The students answer the questions and the teacher collects the answers, reads them, writes some comments on each, and returns them to the students. He does <u>not</u> grade them. The Value Sheets can be used to stimulate ideas before introducing a new topic and again after a week's study. Each student is encouraged to keep a folder of his Value Sheets to provide a record of personal growth.[13]

Harmin and Simon state that not much thinking goes on, in or out of schools, yet the aim of education should be to teach children to think about life and themselves.[14] Personal life decisions and personal values should be chosen critically through a process of examination and analysis. They

suggest several strategies to use with a group: an "I Urge You..." telegram the student is to write to another student; "I learned..." (from the telegram received); "20 Things You Love to Do" sheets; rank ordering of several student activities; or Weekly Reaction Sheets (an inventory of how the student thought and felt and acted during the week).[15]

The Raths, Harmin, Simon approach has much to recommend it. The teacher can use it in any classroom situation, and in any content area. It is easy to understand and fairly easy to use. It is non-threatening and non-judgmental. In the preface to Values Clarification Simon said that the values-clarification approach is not new - there have always been parents and teachers who sought to help young people think through values for themselves. What he and his colleagues have done is to systematize the approach and formulate strategies which relate to the processes of valuing.[16]

Value Conflicts

When students begin to explore their values and work through the valuing process, they will inevitably discover that they hold beliefs which are contrary or which conflict with the beliefs of another person. Sometimes, rational judgments can lead to contradictory courses of action. In this case, a choice will be made, either by force or by some kind of compromise. John Michaelis pointed out that our society places a high premium on the ability to handle value conflicts.[17] Children will meet value conflicts "in personal experiences, in incidents they observe, in current events, and in units of study. The increasing attention paid to problems of disadvantaged and minority groups, urban redevelopment, and newly developing nations has given fresh importance to the need to develop competence in analyzing value conflict."[18]

He listed and briefly described three general strategies for resolving conflict: 1) Critical analysis by the group; 2) Defense of a position; 3) Identification with others.[19]

Fraenkel dealt with value conflicts ~~more~~ extensively. He suggested using a hypothetical situation and asking students to consider alternative courses of action. The teacher would guide the discussion by asking such questions as "What different things might...do?" or "What might happen if...?" This sets up a pattern of teacher probing, student responding, teacher making a follow-through remark. For example, after the students view a film the teacher would ask "What do you think...(the central figure) should have done?" The student would respond with a value judgment and the teacher would accept the response, seeking clarification if necessary.[20] To be able to explore alternative courses of action and their possible consequences the student must be able to empathize. The teacher can only provide the environment in which students can develop a sensitivity to the needs and desires of others; the student learns to identify with other people or with fictional characters by exploring feelings and being free to react. Fraenkel specified useful questions for the teacher to ask in the exploration of feelings, again using the format of teacher questioning, student responding, and teacher following through.[21] This pattern of communication can be increasingly useful as both teacher and student become familiar with it.

Milton Meux assumed that if there was a conflict in value judgments, the source of the conflict must be a difference in the way one of the six tasks for developing capabilities for value analysis was carried out.[22] These tasks are: Identifying and clarifying the value question; Assembling purported facts; Assessing the truth of purported facts; Clarifying the relevance of facts; Arriving at a tentative value decision; and Testing the value principle implied in the decision.[23] Value conflicts are based on differences; if these differences can be examined and accounted for, a resolution of the conflict may occur. To reduce differences in the interpretation of a

value question (Task 1) the teacher might say, "Both of you have stated your value questions rather tersely. Could you both expand your questions so we know just what you both mean?" or "One of you seems to be using the term one way and the other is using the term another way. Do you think you could settle on just one use?"[24] Some of the strategies which might be used include checking on the facts, applying the value judgment to new cases, exchanging roles, and rank-ordering the sources of conflict with respect to their importance. All of the strategies are appropriate to the general principles he gave to use as guides in selecting teaching strategies. He divided these general principles into logical, procedural, and psychological principles. His Logical Principles are:

1. Analyze value conflict into its logical components. (Identifying sources of conflict)

2. Differentiate logical components of the value analysis to reduce differences. (i.e., comparison classes in criteria may be differentiated by narrowing the classes to reduce differences)

3. Re-interpret value objects, criteria, principles, and situations to reduce differences. (Re-interpreting a value object may help reduce conflict by associating the object with another class of things that has a different value. For example, if flouridation is the value object or issue, with one person interpreting or classifying it as compulsory medication and the other person interpreting or classifying it as a public health measure, it would reduce differences if both persons interpreted flouridation as a chemical added to the public water supply.)

4. Appeal to epistemic rules wherever relevant. (Rules of evidence, definitional rules, scientific method, deductive argument, etc.)[25]

These Logical Principles can be seen to depend on division and subdivision of argument. Meux's example of fluoridation raises some question as to the value conflict resolution. Is it not possible to change issues by changing terminology? Is this justifiable? In this case, neither party objects to calling fluoridation a chemical added to the water supply, but that is not the issue. The issue is not <u>what</u> is added but <u>why</u> it is added and <u>what effects</u> it will have. Is there a point at which "reducing differences" can become

a subtle form of indoctrination?

Meux's Procedural Principles have already been mentioned in the discussion of his Rudimentary Procedure. They are:

1. Identify the sources of conflict.
2. Rank the sources of conflict with respect to their importance.
3. Organize the sources of conflict using the Fact-Assembly Chart and Evidence Cards.[26]

The Psychological Principles for resolving conflict that he proposed should be very useful to the teacher, whether he accepts and follows the strategies and procedures of value analysis that Coombs, Meux, and Chadwick postulate or whether he formulates his own strategies. Meux's Psychological Principles are:

1. Resolve easy conflicts before hard conflicts. (One conflict may be easier to resolve because of its size or relative importance.)
2. Break larger conflicts into smaller conflicts, resolving the smaller conflicts first. (It should be easier to resolve a conflict between two individuals of different races than a general racial conflict.)
3. Resolve conflicts involving "shell" values before conflicts involving "core" values. ("Core" values - those values most important to the person, as self esteem, status, religion. "Shell" values - those values least important to the person.)
4. Maintain good will and intention to resolve the value conflict in order to increase the probability of achieving a rational resolution of the value conflict.[27]

The issue of resolving value conflicts rests on shaky ground. Certainly the individual should be helped to resolve his <u>own</u> conflicts, but why should a teacher try to resolve value conflicts between two or more students? Obviously, we live in a world which demands compromise. Perhaps the danger perceived is one of emphasis. All people need to know the skills of compromise to live in a family, a community, to be employed or to employ others. The emphasis should be placed on helping students clarify their own value systems.

REFERENCES

1. John Dewey, Theory of Valuation (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939).

2. Louis E. Raths, Merrill Harmin and Sidney B. Simon, Values and Teaching: Working with Values in the Classroom (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1966), p. 7.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid., p. 5.

5. Ibid., p. 8.

6. Ibid., p. 27.

7. Ibid., p. 28-29.

8. Ibid., p. 30.

9. Ibid., p. 30-32.

10. Ibid., p. 51.

11. Ibid., p. 53-54.

12. Ibid., p. 56-62.

13. Ibid., p. 106-110.

14. Merrill Harmin and Sidney B. Simon, "How to Help Students Learn to Think...About Themselves", The High School Journal, Vol, 55, No. 6 (March 1972), p. 256.

15. Ibid., p. 257-264.

16. Sidney B. Simon, Leland W. Howe, and Howard Kirschenbaum, Values Clarification (New York: Hart Publishing Co., 1972), p. 15-23.

17. John U. Michaelis, Social Studies for Children in a Democracy (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972), p. 256.

18. Ibid., p. 256.

19. Ibid., pp. 256-257.

20. Jack R. Fraenkel, Helping Students Think and Value: Strategies for Teaching the Social Studies (Englewood Cliff, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1973), pp. 238-244.

21. Ibid., pp. 245-253.

22. Milton Meux, "Resolving Value Conflicts," Values Education ed. by Lawrence E. Metcalf (Washington, D. C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1971), p. 121.

23. Jerrold R. Coombs and Milton Meux, "Teaching Strategies for Value Analysis", Values Education ed. by Lawrence E. Metcalf, p. 29.

24. Milton Meux, "Resolving Value Conflicts", p. 124.

25. Ibid., pp. 149-150.

26. Ibid., p. 150.

27. Ibid., pp. 151-152.

VALUES EDUCATION: PART III

Betty Cleaver, Director
Instructional Materials Center
School of Education, UNC-CH

VALUES, SOCIETY, AND THE ROLE OF THE SCHOOL

What is the role of the school in values education? Oscar Granger, a past president of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, said that if he had another sixty years to work, he would educate not only for material gain, but for moral and spiritual values.[1] In his opinion the schools should give more emphasis to building value concepts, and less to storing knowledge.[2] "Our work," he said, "is to educate and train for a free society."[3] This work, carried on by the classroom teacher, can be encouraged by administrative flexibility. As a principal, he would:

1. Organize student activities so they would be more in tune with biological drives (such as hunger, thirst, rest, sex, change).

2. Plan a formal program so that discipline would facilitate positive learning experiences for the individual.

3. Make schedules more flexible so the student would be free to think and reason for himself.

4. Make the best use of both the formal and the informal life of the school to develop value concepts that come more from osmosis than from reasoning and memory.[4]

The implication of the last point is not the negation of reason but the provision of models. This agrees with Michael Belok's statement that "the schools should try to provide conditions which, at least in the environment of the school, make the democratic ideals a reality."[5] These ideals, the attention to the welfare of all people and to the

rights and privileges of the individual, are listed by the Educational Policies Commission in its case book of civic education.[6] The definition and examination of some statement of democratic ideals would certainly be a function of the school.

All of the proponents of values education agree that the school is the instrument of society; the differences are found in educators' ideas of how much responsibility the school should assume in maintaining that society. Dewey thought the school should train the child for leadership as well as obedience.[7] "Apart from participation in social life, the school has no moral end nor aim," he said.[8] Robert Mason refuted the argument that since a plurality of values exists in a free society, the school should remain neutral and objective. He said, "Men have always been concerned to discover, create, or preserve things which are admirable, honorable, and approvable, and they have attempted actively and consciously to accomplish this by controlling the intellectual, social and cultural environment of the young. This active, conscious, purposeful, planned control of the environment of the young by older members of the group in the light of chosen values is what is meant by deliberate education."[9]

There may be an over-emphasis on the effect of the school in shaping the young. James Shaver questioned the school's total impact on the student. "Outside of skill areas such as mathematics, other people and institutions play a more significant role than the school, perhaps because formalizing education takes away from its 'naturalness' and its meaningfulness. Partly for that reason, the school's opportunity for impact is less - certainly qualitatively, if not always quantitatively in terms of the number of hours spent within its confines."[10]

Nevertheless, the school is a creature of the society it serves.[11] School people, teachers and administrators, are agents of that society. This authority-agent relationship has a direct bearing on the role of the school. If a teacher signs a contract but is not committed to the democratic ethos, he has signed it under false pretenses.[12] However, as agent for the society, he is also committed to calling attention to democratic principles whether or not the school population (parents and children) is acting on them. This may put the teacher in the uncomfortable position of standing in opposition to the community he serves. But, said Shaver, the school has educational responsibilities beyond the classroom. "The school cannot be expected to reform the society that supports it. But, as professionals, school people should be concerned with helping their clients - children and parents - clarify and develop their views of the society and the school's role in that society".[13]

Because "the schools operate within a very limited range of human experience"[14] they have become stereotyped, Donald Oliver and Mary Jo Bane told the Moral Education conference in Toronto.[15] Students need to be in contact with adults representing a variety of work experiences, philosophies, and social classes. They need to be free to explore their own environment - <u>their</u> literature, <u>their</u> music. It is difficult to arrange these circumstances in the institutional setting. These authors are currently exploring the possibilities offered by releasing students from conventional studies for a large bloc of time - 6 to 8 weeks - at some point in their high school career. They are convinced that part-time consideration or exploration of values does not generate the necessary commitment.[16] Young people, they said, need an opportunity

"to project themselves in rich hypothetical worlds created by their own imaginations...to test out new forms of social order - and only then to reason about their moral implications. It is quite clear that school is not a likely place for this kind of activity to occur."[17]

What responses might the school make to society's demands for moral education?

1. It could maintain a neutral, objective stance, refusing to allow its teachers to express their personal opinions in the classroom. This would be an abrogation of a primary responsibility, the responsibility the teacher has for holding up justice as a basic principle of democracy.

2. It could use the "bag of virtues" approach[18] - but telling children what they should do or how they should feel is very different from children's orientation to these virtues.

3. It could rely on modeling and the hidden curriculum. The school administration could hope that its teachers would be such attractive models of democratic ideals that their students would imitate them. It would also have to assume that the hidden curriculum - whatever it is that the student is rewarded for - emphasizes critical thinking rather than conforming.

4. It could provide an atmosphere of freedom in which the student's values were appreciated.

The school has the impossible task of satisfying a pluralistic society. It cannot prescribe values, but it can provide an atmosphere of intellectual freedom and it can help the student develop his capability for rational analysis. If we educate our citizens to recognize how their emotions affect their decisions, to use a process of critical analysis in their decision-making, and to recognize and respect the values of others, then the school will have brought an impossible dream, democracy, closer to becoming a reality.

References - Chapter 8

1. Oscar Granger, "Value Concepts in America", Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, Vol. 55, Number 358 (November, 1971), pp. 62-72.

2. Ibid., p. 63.

3. Ibid., p. 68.

4. Ibid., p. 69-72.

5. Michael Belok, "Democratic Society and the Schools", Approaches to Values in Education by Michael Belok, O. R. Bontrager, Howard C. Oswalt, Mary C. Morris, and E. A. Erikson (Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown, Co., 1966), p. 184.

6. Educational Policies Commission, National Education Association, Learning the Ways of Democracy: A Case Book of Civic Education (Washington, D. C.: NEA, 1960), pp. 35-39.

7. John Dewey, Moral Principles in Education (New York: Philosophical Library, 1959), p. 10.

8. Ibid., p. 11.

9. Robert E. Mason, Moral Values and Secular Education (New York: Columbia University Press, 1950), p. 3.

10. James ?. Shaver, "Values and Schooling: Perspectives for School People and Parents", Spring 1972, ERIC Report, ED 067 320, p. 2.

11. Ibid., p. 9.

12. Ibid., p. 18.

13. Ibid., p. 19.

14. D. W. Oliver and M. J. Bane, "Moral Education: Is Reasoning Enough?", Moral Education: Interdisciplinary Approaches ed. by C. M. Beck, B. S. Crittenden, and E. V. Sullivan (Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press, 1971), p. 268.

15. Conference on Moral Education held in Toronto, Canada, June 1968, under the sponsorship of The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

16. Oliver and Bane, "Moral Education: Is Reasoning Enough?", pp. 267-269.

17. Ibid., p. 270.

18. Lawrence Kohlberg, "Stages of Moral Development as a Basis for Moral Education", Moral Education: Interdisciplinary Approaches, pp. 75-76.

VALUES EDUCATION: PART IV

Betty Cleaver, Director
Instructional Materials Center
School of Education, UNC-CH

Research

The evaluation of values education as it exists or as it is proposed is still a matter of subjective judgment. The proponents of various schemes for teaching the process of valuing have taken into account the empirical findings and theoretical accounts of child development and adolescent development, particularly the theories of ego-development. There have been discrete studies, as Kohlberg mentioned, on classroom behavior,[1] school characteristics,[2] and cheating,[3] and the use of the "Public Issues" social studies units.[4] These all have implications for teaching the process of valuing, but they do not measure the effectiveness of instruction. There is no published report of research which assessed two groups of students, used one as the control group and treated the other group by giving it specific instruction in valuing, and then assessed both groups to see if there were any significant differences in the valuing processes of the treatment group.

ERIC published a preliminary report by E. M. Ellis on the progress of the Secondary School Research Program Employing QUESTA. This research is still (1974) in progress in Vancouver, B. C.. A two-part questionnaire was devised by the Educational Testing Service for students, teachers, and administrators "to gather information about the attitudes, values, and perceptions of these groups and the rate and extent to which they change."[5] QUESTA I, focusing on values, attitudes, levels of expectation,

and satisfaction, was to be administered when the student entered high school. QUESTA II could be administered at the end of each year or at the end of the senior year, to measure the impact of the school upon the student's attitudes and values. The research report made generalizations about the areas of agreement and disagreement between students and teachers, but a report of the measurement of change in attitude will not be possible until the first students who took QUESTA I have been graduated from high school. This kind of research, done in conjunction with one of the models for the teaching of values, would give educators very useful information indeed.

One of the most extensive efforts to define moral education has been carried on in England by the Research Unit of the Farmington Trust. Under the direction of John Wilson, a philosopher, work was started in 1965, and is expected to continue for at least ten years. Working with a psychologist (Norman Williams) and a sociologist (Barry Sugarman), Wilson attempted "to make some sort of conceptual sense out of the notion of 'moral education'."[6] The first published report of their research is intended to "reorientate and clarify the thinking of those many people in schools, training colleges, and elsewhere who are concerned with the subject."[7] Secondarily, it is meant to name some practical possibilities for schools, with the full knowledge that their hypotheses are as yet untested. Wilson calls their work "operational research."[8]

These "practical possibilities" are couched in more general terms than the strategies of values clarification and value analysis. Wilson said that the teacher needs to approach moral education from both context and content. Providing an outlet for aggression or making rules clear would come under the heading of context while content would include the

use of subjects such as history or literature to increase the awareness of other people in the society.[9] The "possibilities" need to be much more specific before they will be of any practical assistance to the classroom teacher.

In defining a moral person, Wilson identified six moral components, using letters of classical Greek words to name them. The components are:

1. PHIL - the ability to identify with other people and to accept others as equals.
2. EMP - the ability to emphathize with others.
3. GIG - the mastery of factual knowledge.
4. DIK - the ability to use identification with others, empathy, and factual knowledge in the formulation of ethical principles for all men.
5. PHRON - the ability to use the first three components in the rational formulation of ethical principles for one's own life.
6. KRAT - the ability to translate DIK or PHRON principles into action.[10]

This scheme might have possibilities for mathematical measurement. Wilson said, "It should not be beyond our powers to devise some means of assessing the ratings of these various components. We should then be in a position to do a number of interesting things; for instance:

(i) One could detect just which components were missing in certain classes or groups of people e.g. delinquents, teenagers, etc., or particular sub-groups of these; and conversely - with groups that might have a high ARI rating.

(ii) One could detect what measures increased what ratings (e.g. it is a reasonable guess that the use of films with discussions, etc. would increase EMP).

(iii) One could make a more intelligent guess about what sorts of things schools ought to try, once one knows more precisely where the weak components are.[11]

These are fascinating speculations and in a world where war, food production, and use of natural resources are simulated by computer, it is not unreasonable to assume that moral education may someday be defined binominially.

We have been examining values education in the context of the schools, but Lindly J. Stiles, editor of The Journal of Educational Research, said that it was time for universal consideration of values. In the history of man's existence, many groups and nations were able to co-exist peacefully - each having the freedom to choose its own values. The sparse population of the world and a lack of instant communication made this possible. Today there are no insulators of buffer zones; therefore, in one way or another, value conflicts will be solved. Stiles suggested the alternatives that are available. Mankind can resolve its differences by:

1) Taking no action and allowing a global war to bring civilization to a halt.

2) Allowing a warlike superpower to impose a value system on the world.

3) A cooperative effort of all nations to identify core values and to use teaching and learning techniques to inculcate all humans with these values (allowing subsets of values to account for differences in life style and culture).

He proposed that common effort to identify the values which now allow nations to cooperate be carried out at the direction of UNESCO at formal and informal levels.[12]

In 1974 the state of research on values education is both tentative and promising. The philosopher and the scientist are at work on problems of common concern; each has started at his end of the tunnel. Each can hear the other approaching - the breakthrough may come at any moment.

REFERENCES

1. Lawrence Kohlberg, "Stages of Moral Development as a Basis for Moral Education", Moral Education: Interdisciplinary Approaches (Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press, 1971), p. 25. Jackson - 1968, Dreeben - 1968.

2. Ibid. Jackson - 1968, Dreeben - 1968

3. Ibid., p. 75. Hartshorne and May, 1928-38

4. Ibid., p. 81. Public Issues Units - Lockwood - 1970, Fletcher and Endo, unpublished, and Bane, unpublished.

5. E. M. Ellis, "The Secondary School Research Program Employing QUESTRA, Templeton Secondary School 1971-72", ERIC Report, ED 073 175, p. 2.

6. John Wilson, Introduction to Moral Education by John Wilson, Norman Williams and Barry Sugarman (Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Press, 1967), p. 42.

7. Ibid., p. 31.

8. Ibid., p. 399.

9. Ibid., pp. 408-411.

10. Ibid., pp. 192-193.

11. Ibid., pp. 193-194.

12. Lindley J. Stiles, "Research in Values", Journal of Education Research, Vol. 67, No. 3 (November 1973), Inside cover +.